



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,286	07/17/2003	Adrian Chandley	MSFT-1973/304061.1	2492
41505	7590	02/09/2006	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			PAPE, ZACHARY	
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/621,286	Applicant(s) CHANDLEY, ADRIAN	
	Examiner Zachary M. Pape	Art Unit 2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-11 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-11 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Dictionary Definition</u> |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The following detailed action is in response to the correspondence filed 11/30/2005.

The examiner has withdrawn the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection to claims 10-11, and 13-20 in light of the amendment to claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In the present case, the applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to read, "wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled", and "a mobile docking station that has no computer core when a mobile computer is uninstalled" respectively. The examiner asserts that the specification provides no support and, actually teaches the opposite of such claimed limitations.

The applicant cites paragraph 25 of the written description (specification), specifically, "Since the docking station (210) has no computer of its own because the computer bay 212 is empty, the docking station acts in a smart display mode or terminal". However the definition of a smart terminal as defined by the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary is, "a terminal that contains a microprocessor and random access memory (RAM) and that does some rudimentary processing without intervention from the host computer" (See the attached photocopied page with the definition). Thus in order for the docking station (220) to act as a smart terminal as described, it must in fact have some type of computer core. For this reason the examiner has interpreted claims 1 and 10 as intending to state that the computer is only absent a computer core, not completely absent from any computer core as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamijo et al. (US 6,538,880) in view of Goshey et al. (US 6,473,783).

With respect to claim 1, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. teaches the use of a docking station (110) for a mobile computer (120), the

Art Unit: 2835

docking station (110) absent a computer core when the mobile computer (120) is uninstalled, the docking station comprising: a port (1110), for receiving the mobile computer (120), a communication interface (Column 5, Lines 44-46 teaches that the docking station (110) has wireless communication capabilities) for communicating with at least one external computer, and a display (115) for depicting information exchanged with the at least one external computer, wherein the docking station is itself mobile and enables the communication interface to acquire the information and to display the information when the mobile computer is not installed into the port; and wherein the docking station enables communications with the mobile computer when the mobile computer is installed into the port (Column 3, Lines 40-47; Column 3, Lines 61-67). Kamijo et al. fails to teach that the communication interface communicates with an external computer separate from the mobile computer (120).

Goshey et al. teaches the conventionality of a docking station (112a) communicating with an external computer (112b, 112c, 112d). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer communications art to provide a separate external computer as taught by Goshey et al. to communicate with the docking station (110) of Kamijo et al. to further expand the operation capabilities (attachment to peripheral devices, etc.) of the docking station (110) thus reducing the need to purchase redundant peripheral devices for each local computer system (Goshey et al; Column 2, Lines 4-7). Additionally utilizing the peripheral devices of an external computer as taught by Goshey et al. through a communication interface rids the user of the necessity of attaching the docking station directly to the peripheral device thus saving time.

With respect to claim 10, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. teaches a system supporting communications between a mobile docking station and at least one external computer comprising: a mobile docking station (110) that is absent a computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, the docking station comprising: a port (1110) for receiving the mobile computer (120), a communication interface (Column 5, Lines 44-46 teaches that the docking station (110) has wireless communication capabilities) for communicating with the at least one external computer, wherein the external computer, and a display (115) for depicting information exchanged with the at least one external computer, and the at least one external computer for communicating with the mobile docking station; wherein the mobile docking station (110) enables the communications interface to support communication with the at least one external computer when the mobile computer is both uninstalled from the docking station and without communications with the docking station (The communications interface of the docking station is enabled to communicate with any other external computers through, for example, a traditional wireless network without the mobile computer installed), and wherein the mobile docking station supports communication with at least one external device when the mobile computer is installed (Column 2, Lines 61-62). Kamijo et al. fails to teach that the communication interface communicates with an external computer separate from the mobile computer (120).

Goshey et al. teaches the conventionality of a docking station (112a) communicating with an external computer (112b, 112c, 112d). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer communications art to provide a

Art Unit: 2835

separate external computer as taught by Goshey et al. to communicate with the docking station (110) of Kamijo et al. to further expand the operation capabilities (attachment to peripheral devices, etc.) of the docking station (110) thus reducing the need to purchase redundant peripheral devices for each local computer system (Goshey et al; Column 2, Lines 4-7). Additionally utilizing the peripheral devices of an external computer as taught by Goshey et al. through a communication interface rids the user of the necessity of attaching the docking station directly to the peripheral device thus saving time.

With respect to claims 2 and 11, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. illustrates in Figure 1 that the display is integrated with the docking station.

With respect to claim 3, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. teaches that the port for receiving the mobile computer comprises a connector (Column 4, Lines 53-54).

With respect to claim 4, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches that the port further receives a chassis for the mobile computer (As illustrated in Fig 1).

With respect to claims 6, and 13, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches a user interface comprising one or more of a keyboard (As illustrated in Fig 1), a mouse, a touch screen, a light pen, a stylus, audio interface, tactile transducer, vibration transducer, and an external connector for an external input/output device permitting interaction with rendered information on the display.

With respect to claim 7, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches a receptacle (412) for receiving electrical power (to the mobile computer (120)).

With respect to claims 8 and 14, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further discloses that the communication interface for communicating with at least one external computer is one or more of a wireless connection and a wired connection (Column 5, Line 46).

With respect to claims 9 and 20, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches that the mobile computer (120) is one of an ultra compact computer, a computer core, a handheld computer, and a laptop computer (As illustrated in Fig 4).

With respect to claim 15, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. teaches that the wireless connection is one or more of a radio frequency connection, an infrared connection and an acoustic connection (Column 3, Lines 64-65).

With respect to claim 16, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Goshey et al. further teaches that the at least one external device is one or more of a remote computer (112b) and a peripheral device (118).

With respect to claim 17, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Goshey et al. further teaches that the remote computer is one or more of a desktop computer and a laptop computer (As illustrated in Fig 2a computer 112b is a desktop computer).

With respect to claim 18, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Goshey et al. further teaches that the peripheral device is one or more of a peripheral device

Art Unit: 2835

connected to a computer system (As illustrated in Fig 2a of Goshey) and a stand alone peripheral device.

With respect to claims 19, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches that the at least one external device is one or more of a networking interface, a personal digital assistant, and one or more mobile docking stations (Column 5, Lines 44-46; the mobile computer is clearly able to wirelessly communicate with other external devices and thus is enabled to communicate with, for example one or more mobile docking stations similar to the mobile docking station of Kamijo et al.)

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/30/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In view of the 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph rejection above, the examiner has interpreted claims 1 and 10 as intending to state that the computer is only absent a computer core, not completely absent from any computer core as claimed. Therefore the rejection as set forth above does in fact overcome the claimed limitation as best can be understood by the examiner.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2835

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary M. Pape whose telephone number is 571-272-2201. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. & every other Fri. (8:00am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached at 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2835

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZMP


LYNN FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

.sm

small caps

Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Best Available Copy

SMTP

small caps \smäl kaps\ *n.* A font of capital letters that are smaller than the standard capital letters in that typeface. THIS TEXT IS IN SMALL CAPS.

Small Computer System Interface \smäl' kəm-pyöö'tər si'stəm in'tər-fās\ *n.* See SCSI.

small model \smäl' mod'əl\ *n.* A memory model of the Intel 80x86 processor family that allows only 64 kilobytes (KB) for code and 64 KB for data. See also memory model.

small-scale integration \smäl'skäl in'tə-grā'shən\ *n.* A concentration of fewer than 10 components on a single chip. Acronym: SSI (S'S-I'). See also integrated circuit.

Smalltalk \smäl'täk\ *n.* An object-oriented language and development system developed at Xerox Palo Alto Research Center (PARC) in 1980. Smalltalk pioneered many language and user interface concepts that are now widely used in other environments, such as the concept of an object that contains data and routines and on-screen icons that the user can choose to make the computer perform certain tasks. See also object-oriented programming.

smart \smärt\ *adj.* A synonym for intelligent. See intelligence.

smart cable \smärt' kā'bl\ *n.* See intelligent cable.

smart card \smärt' kărd\ *n.* 1. In computers and electronics, a circuit board with built-in logic or firmware that gives it some kind of independent decision-making ability. 2. In banking and finance, a credit card that contains an integrated circuit that gives it a limited amount of "intelligence" and memory.

smart linkage \smärt' lēnk'əj\ *n.* A feature of programming languages that guarantees that routines will always be called with correct parameter types. See also link (definition 1).

smart quotes \smärt' kwōts\ *n.* In word processors, a function that automatically converts the ditto marks (") produced by most computer keyboards to the inverted commas (" and ") used in typeset text.

SMART system \smärt' si'stəm, S'M-A-R-T\ *n.* Short for self-monitoring analysis and reporting technology system. A system by which technology is used to...

devices, with the object of increasing productivity and protecting data.

smart terminal \smärt' tər'mə-nəl\ *n.* A terminal that contains a microprocessor and random access memory (RAM) and that does some rudimentary processing without intervention from the host computer. Compare dumb terminal.

SMDS \S'M-D-S\ *n.* Acronym for Switched Multi-megabit Data Services. A very high-speed, switched data transport service that connects local area networks and wide area networks through the public telephone network.

smiley \smī'lē\ *n.* See emoticon.

S/MIME \S'mīm, S'-M-I-M-E\ *n.* Acronym for Secure/Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions. An Internet e-mail security standard that makes use of public key encryption. See also public key encryption.

SMIS \S'M-I-S\ *n.* Acronym for Society for Management Information Systems. See Society for Information Management.

smoke test \smök' test\ *n.* The testing of a piece of hardware after assembly or repairs by turning it on. The device fails the test if it produces smoke, explodes, or has some other unexpected violent or dramatic reaction, even if it appears to work.

smooth \smōōdh\ *vb.* 1. To eliminate irregularities in statistical data by some process such as continuous averaging or by removing random (irrelevant) values. 2. In graphics, to remove jagged edges from a figure or line. See also anti-aliasing.

SMP \S'M-P\ *n.* Acronym for symmetric multiprocessing. A computer architecture in which multiple processors share the same memory, which contains one copy of the operating system, one copy of any applications that are in use, and one copy of the data. Because the operating system divides the workload into tasks and assigns those tasks to whatever processors are free, SMP reduces transaction time. See also architecture, multiprocessing.

SMP server \S'M-P' sər-vər\ *n.* Short for symmetric multiprocessing server. A computer that is designed with the SMP architecture to improve its performance as a server in client/server applications. See also SMP.

ory so that some
ll from another
rogramming, a
loop statement

eration without

for Serial Line
ocol that allows
er dial-up tele-
computer or a
to the Internet
a link. IP. Com-

'L-I-P'\ *n.* Soft-
in UNIX shell
.IP connection.
SPs) are UNIX
ers for Internet
SLIP emulator
the ISP's UNIX
ng the Internet
h as graphical
count, SLIP.

net'work\ *n.*
be transmitted
ion. A slotted-
defined time
(frame) in the
transmission
network. Com-

ibility feature
available for
user to add a
must be held
e before it is
e use of the
motor control
when moving

e integration.
ie major geo-